APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,169	02/26/2002	Petri Hyyppa	042933/299815	5147

826   7590   08/05/2009
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
IQBAL, KHAWAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 May 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,9-25,30,33,36,37,40 and 41</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,9-25,30,33,36,37,40 and 41</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2.   Claim 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specifically does not disclose in the original specification "processor and a memory storing executable instructions that in response to execution by the processor" claim 23, lines 1-3.

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 23 recites the limitation "said automatically inserted transaction information" in page 2 and page 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (did not receive response).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 9-25, 30, 33, 36, 37, 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Breek et al (20040210449) in view of Pennell et al (20020013788) and

Kiessling et al (6915124).

Regarding claim 1 Breek et al teaches a method comprising (figs. 1-5):

receiving at a user equipment of information entity including data fields (para. # 0066-

0067, 0077);

automatically inserting information into at least one data field of the information entity

based on information available at the user equipment (automatically filled by the card provider 3

or downloaded from a digital wallet into the payment fields, see fig. 7, transaction information

are automatically filled into the web shopping page by the card provider's web server, para. #

0064-0067, 0077-0078,); and

transmitting the information entity with said automatically inserted transaction

information from the user equipment over a wireless interface (para. # 0040, 0042).

Breek et al does not teach verifying internally at said user equipment on the

basis of an identification code that associates with the user equipment.

In an analogous art, Pennell teaches verifying internally at said user equipment on the

basis of an identification code that associates with the user equipment (para. # 0022-0023 and

0027, web page form 100 filled in automatically in a user device 301). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

device of Breek et al by specifically adding feature verifying internally at said user equipment

automating entry of information into forms displayed on a screen and improve security of the

system as taught by Pennell.

Further Pennell teaches that the browser automation program stores in the user data file 304 the

login member names and passwords for sites for which the user has registered. When the user

accesses the URL for a site, the user is presented with the login helper 801. Login helper 801

allows the user to select the appropriate member name and automatically then enters the correct

password for the user. However, Breek et al and Pennell do not teach the identification code a

Subscriber Identity Module (SIM).

   In an analogous art, Kiessling et al teaches the identification code a Subscriber Identity

Module (SIM) (col. 4, lines 18-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Breek et al and

Pennell by specifically adding feature the identification code a Subscriber Identity Module in

order to provides improved method for executing data allow by SIM as taught by Kiessling et

al.

   Regarding claim 9 Breek et al teaches wherein at least part of the transaction information

to be inserted in the information entity is obtained from a storage unit provided at the user

equipment (automatically filled by the card provider 3 or downloaded from a digital wallet)

(para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 10 Breek et al teaches wherein at least part of the transaction information to be inserted in the information entity is obtained from another information entity available for the user equipment (automatically filled by the card provider 3 or downloaded from a digital wallet) (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 11 Breek et al teaches wherein the user gives a confirmation before said step of inserting information in the information entity (exemplary online log in screen 130, where the cardholder 1 is prompted for authenticating information such as a username 132 and password 134) (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 12 Breek et al teaches wherein the information is inserted by transaction processing unit of the user equipment (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 13 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment inserts information in a data field of the information entity in a predefined manner (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 14 Breek et al teaches wherein the information entity is filled in accordance with predefined instructions (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 15 Breek et al teaches wherein the instructions define the information that is to be inserted in the information entity in response to an event (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 16 Breek et al teaches wherein said information entity is transported as a standardized data entity (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claims 17-19 Breek et al data entity is based on the Electronic Commerce Modeling Language (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 20 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment communicates

transaction information via an interface that is based on at least one of the following: short

message service (SMS); wireless application protocol (WAP); internet protocol (IP); a short

range radio link; a proximity card type interface; an infrared link (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-

0078, see claim 1 above).

Regarding claim 21 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment receives the

information entity via a first type of interface and returns the information entity via a second

type of interface (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 22 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment communicates with a

base station (inherent) of a cellular communication network (para. # 0040, 0042, 0067).

Regarding claim 23 Breek et al a user equipment comprising (figs. 1-5):

a receiving unit configured to receive an information entity including data fields (para. #

0066-0067, 0077-0078);

a processing unit configured to automatically insert information available for the

processing unit in at least of said one data field of said information entity (para. # 0066-0067,

0077-0078); and

a transmitter for transmitting the information entity from the user equipment to a co-operative

device over a wireless interface (para. # 0040, 0042). Breek et al does not teach verifying

internally at said user equipment on the basis of an identification code that associates with the

user equipment.

In an analogous art, Pennell teaches verifying internally at said user equipment on the

basis of an identification code that associates with the user equipment (para. # 0022-0023 and

0027, web page form 100 filled in automatically in a user device 301). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

device of Breek et al by specifically adding feature verifying internally at said user equipment

automating entry of information into forms displayed on a screen and improve security of the

system as taught by Pennell. Further Pennell teaches that the browser automation program

stores in the user data file 304 the login member names and passwords for sites for which the

user has registered. When the user accesses the URL for a site, the user is presented with the

login helper 801. Login helper 801 allows the user to select the appropriate member name and

automatically then enters the correct password for the user. However, Breek et al and Pennell do

not teach the identification code a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM).

In an analogous art, Kiessling et al teaches the identification code a Subscriber Identity

Module (SIM) (col. 4, lines 18-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Breek et al and

Pennell by specifically adding feature the identification code a Subscriber Identity Module in

order to provides improved method for executing data allow by SIM as taught by Kiessling et

al.

Regarding claim 24 Breek et al teaches comprising storage unit configured to store the

transaction information, wherein the processing unit is adapted to fetch information from said

storage means and to insert said information from the storage means into the information entity

(para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 25 Breek et al teaches wherein the processing unit is adapted to obtain

information from at least one other information entity and to insert said information from the at

least one other information entity into said information entity that is the subject of the

information insertion procedure (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claims 30-33 Breek et al teaches wherein the information entity is a form;

form is selected from the group consisting of a billing details form and shipping detail form

(para. # 0040, 0042, 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claims 36-37 Breek et al teaches wherein the transaction information

comprises at least one of: name; address; credit card number; telephone number; or passport

number (para. # 0040, 0042, 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1, above).

Regarding claims 40-41 Breek et al teaches the service provider to indicate a selected one

of options including acceptance and rejection of the information supplied for inclusion in a form

based on a comparison of the identification code to a record of codes (para. # 0040, 0042, 0059,

0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1, above).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9-25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 40-41 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KHAWAR IQBAL whose telephone number is (571)272-7909.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, GEORGE ENG can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/   /K. I./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617   Examiner, Art Unit 2617